

December 21, 1970

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 12175

the congressional delegation with a list of names of people and places to be memorialized by the Congress in naming the river project and some of the structures and bodies of waters along the river.

That committee completed its work last year and brought to us a memorandum which made a series of recommendations for the project and various parts of the project.

That memorandum is essentially reproduced in legislative language in the bill that is before us today. If you take the time to study it, you will see that in addition to honoring the two Senators who have led the fight for this great navigation system, Senator JOHN McCLELLAN, of Arkansas, and Senator Bob Kerr, of Oklahoma, this bill would put names to structures, bodies of water, and overlooks in honor of persons who contributed to the project or communities directly associated with a part of the project or place names that had a particular historical significance in areas adjacent to the project. As one of the sponsors of H.R. 13493, I commend it to the attention of the House.

(Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I want to endorse wholeheartedly H.R. 13493. It is sponsored by our complete Arkansas House delegation—through the leadership of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS). I would like to associate myself with his remarks made here earlier.

In essence, this measure, as amended, would designate the Arkansas River navigation project as the "McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System" and change the name of certain additional projects for navigation and other purposes on the Arkansas River. The changing of the name of the river navigation system would honor two men who more than any others caused this project to be undertaken, and who must be credited for this new dimension in oceangoing commerce for Arkansas and Oklahoma.

It was the vision and foresight of JOHN McCLELLAN, who introduced the original bill, and strong support of the late Senator Bob Kerr, who spoke and worked in behalf of the proposal. As a team, they were all victorious.

Today, almost 30 years and \$2½ billion after the first bill was introduced, the vision has become virtually a whole reality.

Only a few weeks ago, I attended dedication ceremonies in Oklahoma for lock and dam Nos. 14 and 15. Those proceedings were marked by the distinguished presence of former President Lyndon Johnson, the next Speaker of the House, CARL ALBERT, and our esteemed colleague from Oklahoma, Ed EDMONDSON.

Those historical dedication ceremonies marked the completion of another leg of the navigation project which is soon to be fully operational for barge traffic all the way to the Tulsa port of Catoosa.

From the Mississippi to the prairie's edge in Oklahoma, navigation of the Arkansas River was the dream and vision of Senators JOHN McCLELLAN and Robert S. Kerr. It offers new hopes for eco-

nomie and cultural enrichment all along a vast river valley.

These suggested name changes have come to the Arkansas delegation from a resolution by the Arkansas Basin Association. Its members have firsthand knowledge of the many people who have made contributions through the years toward the completion of this great waterway.

One final note on the name the "McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System." When two eminent leaders work together so closely for a goal, sometimes the question arises as to whose names comes first in describing their teamwork.

In this case, Senator McCLELLAN's name leads because he introduced the first legislation in the Senate on the waterway.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13493 honors, among others, two great U.S. Senators who deserve a major share of the credit for the greatest river development program of this generation: The Arkansas River multipurpose project.

Senator Robert S. Kerr, in his lifetime, was a tower of strength in advancing this great navigation, flood control, water storage, and power project.

Senator JOHN McCLELLAN was not only the first legislator in modern times to introduce a bill calling for navigation of the Arkansas; he has also been both quarterback and fullback of the combined Arkansas-Oklahoma congressional effort for the project for many years.

Without JOHN McCLELLAN and Bob Kerr, there would be no Arkansas River navigation system today. It is certainly appropriate that the Congress act to authorize the naming of the great navigation system for those two great Americans.

I hope the other body will speedily join the House in approving this measure.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, some years ago an Arkansan perceived the shape of a dream of a better life for the people who had elevated him to a position of great honor and responsibility. That man was Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN.

An agricultural economy which had served his people well was, he knew, declining. There was a need for bold solutions to the future problems this trend would certainly bring.

The Senator is endowed with a keen insight into the future. He has a compassionate desire to help the people of his native State. Senator McCLELLAN dreamed of vessels of commerce plying the currents of the rivers which thread their way across Arkansas and the mid-continent of America.

Arkansas River and the White River of eastern Arkansas are important among them.

Working with this esteemed colleague from Oklahoma, the late Senator Robert S. Kerr who shared his vision, Senator McCLELLAN embarked on a campaign to make of his dream a reality.

The system of inland waterways they envisioned would mean more to the mid-continent region than any other single project that could have been undertaken.

It can bring to fruition the region's promise of economic development thus far unparalleled by any other period of history.

The development which this system of waterways will support can be a major factor in easing the pressures on other regions of our Nation now reeling under a population explosion.

Already ports are being established along Arkansas inland waterways. Industries have begun building new plants. Others have plans on the drafting boards. And, still others intend to purchase sites for expansion into the region.

My years of experience in inland waterways affairs have convince me there is a pressing need for revising and strengthening Federal, State, and local legislation on port and harbor development. These changes are necessary to increase the vitally needed progress along carefully selected inland waterways.

For the health of the economy of the midcontinent and overall well-being of our Nation, this expansion of water-related industry is essential.

Arkansas water resource potential ranks second in importance only to our people.

The inland waterway transportation system is relatively young. Even so, barges are already handling 15 percent of the U.S. domestic freight being transported.

In 1968, the first national assessment of the Water Resource Council was published under the title "The Nation's Water Resources." It included the estimate that by the year 2020 the freight being moved by water will have increased by 350 percent.

Another idea of what such a system of waterways as the Senators McCLELLAN and Kerr envisioned can do is found in an article which appeared in the May 25, 1970, issue of the U.S. News & World Report. On June 8, I had a copy of this article, titled "Seaports for an Inland Empire" included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This news story investigated the effect of opening the Arkansas River from the Mississippi River to Tulsa, Okla.

At Catoosa, just 3 miles east of Tulsa, a \$20 million port is being developed. A 1,500-acre industrial park will adjoin the port. Officials expect 12.5 million tons of freight to move through this port in 1980.

Navigation along the Arkansas was opened to Little Rock in October 1968. A million tons of freight was forecast for the first year of operation. The river traffic actually moved 2.225 million tons.

Little Rock's public port, which has terminal and warehouse facilities, is in operation. A steel plant is under construction in the industrial area adjoining the port. In 1969, a million tons of bauxite from the Caribbean flower across private docks there and into the processing facilities of nearby aluminum plants.

At Russellville, upstream from Little Rock, the Arkansas Power & Light Co. is building a \$140 million nuclear plant. It is made possible by the existence of one of the numerous lakes created by the project to make the river navigable.

H 12176

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

December 21, 1970

In Fort Smith, Ark., the Kansas City Southern Lines Railway has set aside 2,000 acres for an industrial park and port. The Kerr-McGee Corp. has dedicated a \$25 million uranium processing plant near Sallisaw, Okla.

This firm is also planning to build a \$20 million facility in the region.

In addition, Armco Steel, North American Rockwell, Skelly Oil, and Phillips Petroleum have or are planning to have plants along the river.

Water-based recreation activities have also benefited greatly. In 1969 alone, more than a million visitors were counted at 14 recreation sites around the Dardanelle Reservoir.

In May of this year, the Department of Commerce, recommended that 32 port sites be reserved now in small communities on the waterway.

There does not have to be a conflict between this development and the goals of the environmentalists and the conservationists.

As Senator JOHN McCLELLAN told the U.S. News writer:

We don't intend to let the river become polluted. It is easier to prevent it than to remedy it.

Arkansas and the midcontinent region have the potential for the greatest inland waterway system in the world.

Completion of the development of the White River will allow the First Congressional District of Arkansas to share in the prosperity. The work will allow other regions of the Nation to benefit from the products and resources of northeast Arkansas.

It will add this river to the 14,000 miles of waterways now serving the Nation's needs.

This development can be accomplished without sacrificing the interests of conservationists and environmentalists.

As I stand here before the Speaker's chair, I again contemplate the words of Daniel Webster which are engraved in stone on the frieze of this Chamber's walls:

Let us deliver the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation, may not perform something to be remembered.

These immortal words are symbolic of the life of Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN—of his dedication to work in the finest tradition of this land.

It is fitting that today we move to honor this effort by passing H.R. 13493. Let us further honor the dreams of Senator McCLELLAN and Kerr by wisely developing our midcontinent waterway resources.

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker I am delighted that the House of Representatives will today adopt H.R. 13493, in which I joined in sponsorship with my three Arkansas colleagues. This legislation provides that the Arkansas River and comprehensive development project shall be known and designated as the "McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System."

Such a designation is a fitting tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas, who, along with the late Sen-

ator Robert S. Kerr, initiated and pushed through the legislation that resulted in the creation of the Arkansas River Navigation project. Senator McCLELLAN deserves our praise for his insistence that the Arkansas River Valley be allowed to assume its rightful place in the economic progress of the United States.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the Record on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT ACT OF 1964

The Clerk called the bill (S. 4571) to amend the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement Act of 1964 for Certain Employees, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, since this legislation is scheduled for consideration under suspension of the rules, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Abbitt	Clawson, Del.	Galliganakis
Adair	Clay	Gallagher
Andrews,	Collins, Ill.	Gibbons
N. Dak.	Conyers	Gilbert
Ashbrook	Corbett	Gray
Ashley	Coughlin	Griffiths
Aspinall	Cowser	Haley
Ayres	Crane	Hall
Baring	Daddario	Halpern
Barrett	Daniels, N.J.	Harsha
Berry	Delaney	Hastings
Blackburn	Denney	Hébert
Blatnik	Dent	Helstoski
Brook	Devine	Hicks
Brooks	Diggs	Horton
Brown, Calif.	Dowdy	Hull
Burke, Fla.	Dulski	Hunkate
Burlison, Mo.	Dwyer	Jarman
Burton, Utah	Edwards, Calif.	Landrum
Buttton	Edwards, La.	Jansen
Caffery	Evins, Tenn.	Latta
Camp	Fallon	Leggett
Carey	Farostein	Long, La.
Chisholm	Fascell	Lujan
Clancy	Fish	Lukens
Clausen,	Foreman	McCarthy
Don H.	Fulton, Tenn.	McClory

McCloskey	Olsen	Scheuer
McCulloch	O'Neal, Ga.	Sebellus
McKneally	Ottlinger	Shipley
Macdonald,	Patman	Sikes
Mass.	Pelly	Sisk
MacGregor	Pettis	Snyder
Martin	Podell	Steele
Mathias	Powell	Steiger, Ariz.
May	Price, Tex.	Stephens
Meskill	Rarick	Sullivan
Michel	Reifel	Taft
Mills	Rhodes	Thompson, N.J.
Minish	Rivers	Tunney
Minshall	Roe	Waggonner
Mize	Rostenkowski	Waldie
Monagan	Roudebush	Welcker
Montgomery	Rousselot	Wiggins
Moorhead	Ruppe	Winn
Morton	Ruth	Wold
Moss	St Germain	Wolf
Murphy, Ill.	Sandman	Wylder
Murphy, N.Y.	Satterfield	Young
Nedzi	Saylor	Zwach
O'Konski	Scherle	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 284 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PROHIBITING CERTAIN USES OF SEALS OF THE UNITED STATES, PRESIDENT, AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 14645) to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit certain uses of likenesses of the great seal of the United States, and of the seals of the President and Vice President, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, after line 9, insert:

"Sec. 4. Section 3056 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

"(1) by adding the following clause after the second clause thereof: 'protect the person of a visiting head of a foreign state or foreign government and, at the direction of the President, other distinguished foreign visitors to the United States and official representatives of the United States performing special missions abroad;' and

"(2) by striking the words 'Chief, Deputy Chief, Assistant Chief' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Director, Deputy Director, Assistant Directors, Assistants to the Director'.

SEC. 5. Section 3506 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by section 4 of this Act, shall be subject to Reorganization Plan Numbered 26 of 1950 (64 Stat. 1280).

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit certain uses of likenesses of the great seal of the United States, and of the seals of the President and Vice President, and to authorize Secret Service protection of visiting heads of foreign states or governments, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object, because I am wholeheartedly in support of the legislation—I would ask, however, that the gentleman explain for the benefit of the Speaker and the Members of the House the purpose of the Senate amendments.

S 20952

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

December 21, 1970

Nor did it mean Congress had neglected current problems of great import. The record of these earlier Congresses is a good one in terms of legislation enacted.

For two years, however, Congress has dawdled, postured, delayed. Indeed, this year even a matter of such moment as the general election could not stir Congress from its lethargy and we have endured the first lame duck session of Congress in two decades—and with equally negative results.

That the public business has suffered is incontrovertible. But my concern is that Congress itself will be the great loser, should this pattern continue.

Not just impatient youth, but an impatient America could well lose confidence in the First Branch of Government.

Who bears responsibility for this? Certainly not the Majority Leader, Mike Mansfield. I have watched with admiration his unceasing efforts to keep the Senate on the track, that this session might come to a dignified and timely close. Because of him, the competition so necessary to our two-party system has been keen, realistic, but always gentlemanly. For this I personally owe him a great debt of gratitude, and so do all of us, whether Republican or Democrat.

Nevertheless, the question persists as to why this unbelievable delay in carrying out the fundamental, inescapable duties of Congress. In the Senate, at least, I think it has come about because of a confusion between targets of opportunity and targets of necessity. In the field of new legislation to control crime, the Senate indeed led the way, but in other ways our penchant for talk often delayed action beyond sufferable limits.

Given the diversity of America, its boiling energy, its native zeal for problem-solving by legislative fiat, there are an unending array of targets of opportunity for Senators—especially if their ambitions go beyond the Chambers of Congress.

It is good at times to remind ourselves that all problems are not of the same order, to be legislated on at the same time by the U.S. Senate; that ours is indeed a Federal system of government, with many problems handled more effectively, more rapidly, and thereby more equitably, at the State and local levels.

There is a failure, a refusal to recognize that by putting aside the targets of necessity, by failing to do what must be done first, the Senate is adding to the Nation's sense of confusion and loss of confidence. By rushing for targets of opportunity, by seeking to gain recognition as the most avant of the avant-garde, Senators are contributing to a horrendous legislative quagmire; one which cannot fail to have damaging repercussions throughout the rest of government.

Mr. President, my previous report, my first as Minority Leader, was clouded with sorrow because of the unexpected and untimely death of our beloved Minority Leader, Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen. We all felt keenly the loss of his guidance and steady counsel. We knew we would have to carry on, and we strove, each of us in his own way, to follow the path he had marked for us.

As in all things, however, those of us who survive must shoulder our own burdens. The Republic continues to exist. We in the Senate must go on to deal with the problems confronting us today.

The real re-ordering of those priorities, about which so much is said, not already re-ordered by the Executive shift toward social needs, must begin with a candid appraisal by each of us in the Senate as to what must be done in what order and what can be done well, if we are to contribute legislative thrust to genuine progress in America. In making this evaluation, I must acknowledge the unflinching assistance and thoughtful leadership of the assistant floor leader, Senator

Robert P. Griffin of Michigan; the chairman of the Republican Conference, Senator Margaret Chase Smith of Maine; the chairman of the Republican Policy Committee, Senator Gordon Allot of Colorado; and the Secretary of the Republican Conference, Senator Milton R. Young of North Dakota.

I am particularly mindful of and grateful for the thoughtful cooperation of my political colleagues, and especially for the assistance of the Regional Whips who have made possible steady monitoring of the proceedings of this Body.

Mr. President, with these thoughts in mind I offer this Republican Report for the Second Session of the 91st Congress.

Mr. President, the guts of my Minority Report boil down to a consideration of these facts: That this Congress has quite literally dawdled for two full years; that this is not the fault of, nor should blame be attached to, the distinguished Majority Leader of the Senate; that laxity has added to the Nation's confusion and loss of confidence in government; the worsening delay in the appropriations process is an unprecedented embarrassment to Congress; that President Nixon has succeeded in greatly cutting troop strength in Asia, winding down the war, taking the initiative in cutting defense spending, and at the same time has in large measure succeeded in effecting a transformation of the Nation from a wartime to a peacetime economy; that he has inherited the inflationary crop which was sown in the credit-card 1960's, yet managed to cool down a white-hot economy without throwing the Nation into depression; and that America is on the verge of an unprecedented period of social renewal and regeneration.

In effect, the overall policy of the Nixon Administration has been to restore our confidence in our own country. To call attention to the resources of talent, of technique, of experience still so abundantly available throughout America. To remind us that we are magnificently experienced practitioners of democracy under our Federal system.

A reading of the Nixon messages to Congress makes this quite clear. We see honest appraisals of what has been tried and found wanting—to name but a few programs—in education, welfare, manpower training and urban restoration. Thereafter have come proposals to move away from what was possibly the worst of two worlds insofar as public administration goes: far too many categories of aid programs, with an overcentralized bureaucracy administering each of them.

In a sense this was a hangover from the 1930's. In those days, state and local governments were in the main badly equipped to handle the new type aid and welfare programs established by Federal enactment.

Not so in 1970. But a mentality has been created, a habit of administering most difficult to change in a bureaucracy, and apparently, among many members of Congress as well. But change will come, and Republicans seek to provide the leadership for it.

We have not lost our way; there is no doubt in my mind that America is on the verge of a great period of social renewal, of regeneration. It will not be easy, and here perhaps, is the time to ask ourselves whether we may not have made a serious mistake in the past.

We have tried to justify our American democracy in terms of affluence, of statistics indicating world leadership in automobile, television, bathtub and telephone ownership. We have made it appear to promise a life of ease and safety.

Democracy is really the most dangerous and the riskiest form of political society. Even so, it works. Great trust, responsibility and power is put into the hands of great numbers of people. Particularly is this true under the American Federal system.

To reinvigorate Federalism is to very clearly

vote for this "dangerous" dispersion of power, in the firm belief that we will better respond to the challenge to renew our America.

What has been lost in American life must be found.

What doesn't work must be discarded.

What works, must be made to work better.

There are mountains ahead.

But there are men beyond the mountains.

The strength of our land lies in ourselves.

We Americans must make tomorrow better.

INTRODUCTION

For a decade, while American eyes were turned moonward and American blood drained in Southeast Asia, a multitude of problems—domestic and foreign—were allowed to mount; Nostrums were offered but few real solutions appeared. Now the Republic is awash with unsolved problems in three basic categories:

From War to Peace

The Economic Effects

Social Renewal

In each of these areas the 91st Congress has been called upon to chart a crucial course in the search for solutions. The degree as to which the Senate discharged its responsibility was not so much due to the Senate itself as to an aroused public, and elections just past.

For much of the first 20 months of the 91st Congress, the Senate seemed more impressed with the need to posture, to pose in grand debate, than to seek answers. The General Election of November 3 was but weeks away when the Senate finally abandoned its rhetoric and began to act on a wide field of issues.

It is not unfair to say that this Congress has been painfully lacking in a sense of responsibility. Nearly a full six months of Fiscal 1971 went by before the final appropriations bill for the fiscal year was passed. This laxity has cost the taxpayers billions of dollars that could have been saved had the 91st Congress acted in proper time. It is not fiscally responsible to let half a year go by, to be paid for under continuing resolutions, while mandatory fiscal legislation languishes in a logjam of verbiage.

In both 1969 and 1970, months were devoted to debating issues already decided.

To change direction after eight years of experimentation without positive result, President Nixon called upon the Congress for action on a wide front. He sent no fewer than 82 messages to the Congress requesting specific legislative action.

Moving a Nation from a wartime, forced-draft, economy to peacetime productivity is an enormous task. Congress was presented an outline on how best this could be done. Congress dragged its heels, put off action, and delayed.

It would appear on the surface the membership of the Senate Majority Policy Committee of this Congress has insisted on the right of *ius primae noctis* on every measure presented by the President to meet pressing national and international commitments.

Typical of this delay, and of the insistence by the majority that their own special stamp be placed on all legislation, is the recent over-hasty, last-minute action on the national railroad labor dispute.

On February 27, 1970, President Nixon proposed to Congress enactment of the Emergency Public Interest Protection Act of 1970. That proposal was designed to prevent exactly what did happen—a railroad tieup caused by a labor dispute. Eight months later no action had been taken; the proposal lay dormant in the womb of Congress.

Not until the night of December 9 did Congress hastily put together a law designed to postpone the railroad strike.

Severe warnings had long been posted that a strike was on its way. For months the strike had been delayed and postponed, and there had been some short rail stoppages. All this

December 21, 1970

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 20951

Mr. JAVITS subsequently said: Mr. President, on Saturday, certain analyses were made by the distinguished Senator from Delaware respecting the effect of the family assistance plan contained in the Ribicoff-Bennett proposal upon my State of New York. I asked the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to analyze those analyses made by Senator WILLIAMS. They do not agree with him, Mr. President, as to their effect and the alleged inequities which would result. I shall discuss these in detail at an appropriate time, but I did feel that at the earliest moment they should stand in the Record, so that anyone who wishes may read these replies.

So I ask unanimous consent that the letter of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, signed by the Honorable John G. Veneman, Under Secretary, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
December 21, 1970.

HON. JACOB JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: The following is in response to your request for comment on certain statements made by Senator Williams (Delaware) in the Congressional Record of December 19, relating to the effect of the Ribicoff-Bennett proposal upon the State of New York.

On page S20807, Senator Williams cites an example that leaves the impression that the Ribicoff-Bennett proposal would pay a \$1300 bonus for an illegitimate child.

He states that "this bill actually provides a \$1300 bonus from the Federal Government to a mother to have an illegitimate baby over and above what would be paid if the baby were born in wedlock."

Under the existing AFDC program, a childless couple is not eligible for benefits—nor would they be under the Family Assistance Plan. The presence of children is required for eligibility.

In fact, it is the present program which rewards illegitimacy. Currently, families in which the father is married and working full time are not eligible for any federally assisted welfare. But if the father were not married to the mother, she and her children would be eligible. FAP, would for the first time make the intact family eligible thus reducing the financial reward for illegitimacy.

The Bill also mandates State supplementation to families in which the father is unemployed. This is now done in New York on an optional basis but it not done in 25 states. In these latter states, an intact family may now receive no assistance even though it has no income. In contrast, families where the father has deserted or in which the child is illegitimate would be eligible. Thus, the Ribicoff-Bennett proposal is a step toward reducing illegitimacy and desertion.

In Senator Williams comments he left another distorted impression regarding benefits available in New York.

In the chart published on page S 20810, an impression is left that a family of four in New York without any earnings would receive money and benefits totaling \$6210.

The following facts must be considered:

(a) probably no more than 1 or 2% of the families on public assistance in New York have available to them all of the benefits listed on the chart.

(b) only 7½% of the welfare recipients in New York City live in public housing, which is worth \$989 to a family without income.

Ninety-two and a half percent of the families do not receive this \$989.

(c) The impression is also left that all recipients receive food stamps valued at \$312 annually. The fact is that 60% of the welfare recipients in New York do not participate in the food stamp program.

(d) The impression is left that every family on public assistance receives \$1153 in medical benefits. This is the average expenditure in New York and is available only if there is illness. The payments are made directly to the providers of the medical services for an illness incurred by the family.

Another issue was raised by Senator Williams on page 20807 where he stated that "in New York, a welfare family will collect a higher premium on family splitting. They collect \$2508 more as two families than if they live as one family. They can collect that every year under this bill, if they will just separate—the husband taking part of the children and the wife taking the other children."

This is highly distorted. In this respect the Bill does not change the present law. In New York, under law, a family of six, husband, wife and four children receive a total of \$329 per month, plus rent. A family of three receives a cash payment of \$179 per month plus rent. Thus, the total of two families of three would be \$358 per month plus rent. This means that the net cash differences between one family of six and two families of three is \$29 per month or \$348 per year rather than \$2508 stated by Senator Williams. The family situation with respect to rent, Medicaid, and food stamps would be the same in both cases.

If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

JOHN G. VENEMAN,
Under Secretary.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have shown a copy of this letter to Senator WILLIAMS, who desires me to yield on this matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator from New York putting this letter in the Record, and I note it is signed by Mr. Veneman.

I only point out that the charts I used in my statement of last Saturday and the figures I quoted were also presented to the committee by Mr. Veneman, the same Mr. Veneman. This is the first time I have heard of an administration contradicting his own figures by claiming he gave false information to a congressional committee.

This only shows the confusion and that they cannot even agree 2 days at a time, because all the figures I used were over the signature and finished by HEW. Let them decide which time they are telling the truth.

It further supports my position that we should reject this bill, and I think we need some new men in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare who at least can stay on the same side of a question 24 hours.

I shall discuss this letter later. Perhaps the committee erred in not placing the Government witnesses under oath.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 4571) to amend the Central Intelli-

gence Retirement Act of 1964 for Certain Employees, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1162) to amend Public Law 403, 80th Congress, of January 28, 1948, providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

S. 578. An act to include firefighters within the provisions of sections 8336(c) of title 5, United States Code, relating to the retirement of Government employees engaged in hazardous occupations;

S. 3835. An act to provide a comprehensive Federal program for the prevention and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism; and

S. 4106. An act to amend the Public Health Service to authorize the assignment of commissioned officers of the Public Health Service to areas with critical medical manpower shortages, to encourage health personnel to practice in areas where shortages of such personnel exist, and for other purposes.

AUTHORITY TO PRINT REPORT OF THE MINORITY LEADER ENTITLED "WAR TO PEACE: SOCIAL REGENERATION" AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, Benjamin Disraeli, a liberal Tory, once said that decision destroys suspense, and suspense is the charm of existence.

We have had, in this session, more suspense than decision, and I must add that I am far from charmed.

Mr. President, I am about to submit the minority leader's annual report, and I ask unanimous consent to have this annual report of the minority leader for the second session of the 91st Congress, entitled "War to Peace: Social Regeneration," printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCOTT. I shall not attempt to read the entire report at this time, but I ask to have it printed in full. I want to extend to my many colleagues, because I do not listen to them all the time, the recognition that they do not have to listen to me, either.

The report opens with a quotation from Vergil and a quotation from Homer, and then begins in earnest as follows:

In our youth-oriented society, it may be somewhat rash to indulge in reminiscences of the good old days. But as this 91st Congress creeps and crawls toward adjournment, I cannot help but recall another and Golden Age.

Time was when Congress actually finished its legislative business before Americans congregated to sing Auld Lang Syne to the departing year; in fact, even before Santa Claus began his annual goodwill run.

Yes, it is a fact, Virginia, there was once an era when Congress sniffed the fall air and took the turning leaves as a signal to close its books. Traditionally, the last appropriation bill to be considered was for foreign aid monies. Once passed, adjournment came mercifully and swiftly.